

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-13, 15-18, 20 and 21 are now pending in the application. Applicant amends claims 1, 4-6, 9-11, 15-18 and 20-21, and cancels claims 3 and 8. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed. Accordingly, no new matter is added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-13, 15-18, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Arnold et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,440,723). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding Applicant's traverse and solely in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 4-6, 9-11, 15-18, and 20-21.

Amended claim 1 recites a method of preventing virus infection performed by a computer connected to a network. The method includes obtaining communication information when a virus intrudes into the computer, detecting a virus source computer based on the communication information obtained, sending a message announcing an antivirus attack on the virus source computer, and making the antivirus attack on the virus source computer from the computer by imposing a high load.

Amended claim 6 recites a system for preventing virus infection formed on a computer connected to a network. The system includes a communication information analysis means that detects intrusion of a virus into the computer, and then on detecting virus intrusion, detects a virus source computer based on communication information

obtained when the virus intrudes; a computer attack means that makes an antivirus attack on the virus source computer through the network from the computer, for suppressing operation of the virus; a message sending means that sends a message for announcing a start of the attack, to the infected computer; and the computer attack means imposes a high load on the virus source computer.

Amended claim 17 recites a system for preventing virus infection formed on a computer connected to a network. The system includes a request receiving means that receives a request for making an antivirus attack on a virus source computer, and a computer attack means in the computer that makes an antivirus attack on the virus source computer through the network for suppressing operation of a virus, based on the request received.

Amended claim 18 recites a program stored on a computer readable medium that is read into a computer connected to a network and makes the computer operate preventing virus infection. The program makes the computer realize: a communication information analysis means that detects intrusion of a virus, and then on detecting virus intrusion, detects a virus source computer based on communication information obtained when the virus intrudes; a computer attack means that makes an antivirus attack on the virus source computer from the computer through the network, for suppressing operation of the virus; a message sending means that sends a message for announcing a start of the attack, to the infected computer; and the computer attack means imposes a high load on the virus source computer.

For anticipation to be present under 35 U.S.C §102(b), there must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure as viewed by

one skilled in the field of the invention. Scripps Clinic & Res. Found. V. Genentech, Inc., 18 USPQ.2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 1991). All of the limitations of the claim must be inherent or expressly disclosed and must be arranged as in the claim. Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc., 7 USPQ.2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Here, Arnold fails to disclose the limitation of that the virus source computer is attacked by the computer which detected the virus infection as claimed in claims 1, 6 and 18 or a computer which receives a request for making an attack as claimed in claim 17.

More particularly, Arnold discloses a technique to detect a virus by deploying a decoy, sending a detection report, and killing the virus, etc. Arnold, however, does not disclose a technique to attack a virus source computer by a computer which detected the virus infection or by a computer which receives a request for making an attack.

In the claimed invention, the attack is made by imposing a high load on the virus source computer. This attack does not kill or remove the virus but instead prevents the virus from spreading to the other computers via the network. Therefore, the function of the claimed invention is completely different from the performance of generally-used antivirus software. According to the Office Action, there is a disclosure in Arnold with regard to an antivirus attack on a virus source computer (fig. 5, Block A-E). Applicant respectfully disagrees. No specific attacking means is disclosed in Arnold.

In order to prevent the virus from spreading, the claimed invention can be applied even if antivirus software already exists and even if that antivirus software has never been implemented. In contrast, Arnold does not disclose any technique to make an attack by imposing an external load on the virus source computer.

Thus, in the claimed invention, a computer, which is different from the virus source computer, makes an attack on the virus source computer for suppressing operation of the virus. The attack for suppressing the operation of the virus is preferably made by imposing a high load on the virus source computer. The attack is made, for example, by the computer which detected the virus intrusion (claims 1, 6, and 18) or a computer which receives a request for making an attack (claim 17).

Inasmuch as the prior art fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, the prior art cannot anticipate claim 1, 6, 17 or 18. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9-13, 15, 16, 20 and 21 should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and

favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 6, 2009

By: /G. Gregory Schivley/  
G. Gregory Schivley  
Reg. No. 27,382  
Bryant E. Wade  
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BEW/pvd